

REMARKS

In the above identified application, in the Office Action mailed March 29, 2005, the examiner allowed applicants' claims 15-24, and identified the presence of allowable subject matter in claims 2, 4-5, 8-9 and 12. The remaining claims 1, 3, 6-7, 10-11 and 13-14 were rejected in view of cited prior art references, with primary reliance upon an asserted combination of Gutknecht, U.S. Patent 4,979,881 and Fischer, U.S. Patent 6,425,743.

In addition, in the Office Action, the examiner requested submission of a revised and shortened Abstract paragraph. The examiner also requested minor editorial revisions to claims 10 and 19-24.

In response, applicants submit herewith a revised and shortened Abstract paragraph, in compliance with PTO rules, namely, within the range of 50 to 150 words.

In addition, by this Response, applicants have implemented the examiner's suggested editorial revisions to claims 10 and 19-24.

Further, by this Response, applicants have amended original independent claim 1 to incorporate the limitations from related and now-canceled dependent claim 2. Since the examiner identified the presence of allowable subject matter in dependent claim 2, claim 1 as now presented is respectfully submitted to be in proper form for allowance.

Related dependent claims 3, 6, 7, and 10-12 remain in this application and add further limitations to parent claim 1 as now presented. Of these dependent claims, the dependency of claim 12 has been revised for proper referral to parent claim 1 as now presented. Since claim 1 as now written is believed to be in condition for allowance, there dependent claims 3, 6, 7, and 10-12 are submitted for allowance therewith.

In addition, by this Response, original dependent claims 4, 8 and 9 have been revised to independent form, consistent with the examiner's indication of

allowable subject matter. Accordingly, as now presented, these claims 4 (and related remaining dependent claim 5), 8 and 9 are also submitted for allowance.

Finally, applicants re-submit original claims 13 and 14 for reconsideration and allowance, without revision. These claims were rejected in the Office Action for alleged obviousness in view of the cited combination of Gutknecht and Fischer references, considered together with Sabini, U.S. Patent 6,048,168.

Independent claim 13 recites applicants' novel bearing system to include a "coolant cavity" defined cooperatively by a removable "bearing carrier" and a "housing", and further wherein this "coolant cavity" is "sealed" at opposite ends by "elastomeric bands". This recited combination of features is respectfully submitted to distinguish clearly and patentably from the cited art. Indeed, applicants respectfully contend that independent claim 13 (and its related dependent claim 14) should be allowable for the same reasons noted by the examiner with respect to original dependent claim 2.

The Gutknecht reference clearly does not disclose or suggest this combination of features recited in claim 13. Gutknecht has no "elastomeric bands" or other elastomeric elements for supporting an elongated bearing carrier, or for cooperating with a bearing housing to define a "coolant cavity".

The Fischer reference shows elastomeric elements for supporting a bearing mounting sleeve, but Fischer's mounting sleeve does not cooperate with any outer housing to define a "coolant cavity", and Fischer's elastomeric elements do not close and seal opposite ends of any such "coolant cavity". As such, applicants respectfully contend that the Fischer reference cannot be combined with the Gutknecht reference to render claims 13 and 14 obvious under 35 USC 103.

The Sabini reference has been cited for disclosing ceramic type ball bearings. Nothing in the Sabini reference is capable of overcoming the fundamental deficiencies of the Gutknecht and Fischer references, as noted above. Sabini does not disclose or suggest any counterpart to applicants'

claimed "coolant cavity" having opposite ends closed and sealed by "elastomeric bands", as recited in independent claim 13.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully re-submit claims 13 and 14 without change for reconsideration and allowance.

A Notice of Allowance directed to claims 1 and 3-24 of this application is believed to be in order, and is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KELLY LOWRY & KELLEY, LLP



Stuart O. Lowry
Registration No. 26,563

SOL:cw
6320 Canoga Avenue, Suite 1650
Woodland Hills, California 91367
(818) 347-7900